

**REMARKS*****Claim Amendments***

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly and distinctly describe the annular ridge (40) as including an upstream ridge region (44) protruding from the surface of the upstream seat region (22) and an adjacent downstream ridge region (46) protruding from the surface of the downstream seat region (20, 24). Support for this amendment is found in the specification as filed, for example in Fig. 2b and on page 9 line 20 through page 10 line 13. No new matter is introduced by these claim amendments.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102***

Claims 1, 3-4, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 4,153,205 to Parrish, Jr. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Applicants' claim 1 is amended to specify, in part, that the valve member (10) further comprises an annular ridge (40) that includes an upstream ridge region (44) protruding from the surface of the upstream seat region (22) and an adjacent downstream ridge region (46) protruding from the surface of the downstream seat region (20, 24), said protruding annular ridge (40) defining an annular seating line (112) at the intersection of the upstream and downstream ridge regions (44,46), said seating line (112) having a seat diameter, the seating line (112) being engageable with the valve seating surface (14) to control fuel injection from the nozzle body (16).

In contrast, Parrish, Jr. teaches a valve 15 formed with an upper conical surface 35 joining a lower conical surface 36 to form the initial valve seat seal 25 formed by the connecting

line of the two surfaces 35, 36 (column 3, lines 39-43). The Office Action identifies upper conical surface 35 of Parrish, Jr. as corresponding to Applicants' upstream seat region (22), with the lower portion of the same upper conical surface 35 corresponding to Applicants' upstream ridge region (44). Applicants submit that this is not a teaching of an annular ridge (40) that includes an upstream ridge region (44) protruding from the surface of the upstream seat region (22), as specified in Applicants' amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Parrish, Jr. does not teach and every limitation in Applicants' amended claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Parrish, Jr., and request that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claims 3-4 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons above. Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 3-4 and 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103***

The Office Action rejects claims 5-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No 14,153,205 to Parrish, Jr. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-11 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 5-11 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is believed, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of objection and rejection have been addressed and overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance. If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark H. Svoboda/

---

Mark H. Svoboda  
Reg. No. 64,953

Telephone (248) 813-2653  
Delphi Technologies, Inc.  
Legal Staff – M/C 483-400-402  
P.O. Box 5052  
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052